DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 067 SP 034 529

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE A Study of the Knowledge and Competencies Demonstrated by Preservice Teachers of the Fine Arts.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Teachers; Competency Based Teacher Education; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Fine Arts; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; *Music Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Pedagogical Content Knowledge; Preservice Teachers; Washburn University of Topeka KS

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on two studies conducted at Washburn University (Kansas) to evaluate the ability of preservice fine arts teachers to transmit knowledge of subject to students through the demonstration of teaching competencies. Answers were sought to the following questions: (1) what were the perceptions relative to student teachers' knowledge of subject; and (2) to what extent were teaching competencies demonstrated. The sample in the first study consisted of student teachers (N=22) prepared to teach music, and their cooperating teachers (N=24); the second study included student teachers (N=12) prepared to teach art, along with their cooperating teachers (N=13). Cooperating teachers provided ratings data with respect to the abilities demonstrated by student teachers; preservice teachers provided data using the same evaluative instrument designed for assessing their own competencies and knowledge of the subject fields. Thirty-one tables display findings of subject area knowledge and competencies assessments, and frequency of response to numerical positions of rating scale by cooperating teachers and students in art and music from 1985-1990. The paper concludes with a technical discussion of results and copies of evaluative instruments. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358067

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SP

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. SO-AR

A STUDY OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCIES DEMONSTRATED BY PRESERVICE TEACHERS OF THE FINE ARTS

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

APRIL 26, 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP034529

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Study of the Knowledge and Competencies
Demonstrated by Preservice Teachers of Music. 3
Introduction. 3
Problem Statement 3
Research Design 4
The Mean and Standard Deviation 5
The Chi-Square. 5
The Mean Values and Standard Deviations for Music 7
The Frequency of Responses Relative to the Numerical
Position on the Rating Scale for Music. 20
A Study of the Knowledge and Competencies
Demonstrated by Preservice Teachers of Art 21
Problem Statement. 21
Research Design. 22
The Mean Values and Standard Deviations for Art. 25
The Frequency of Responses Relative to the Numerical
Position on the Rating Scale for Art 41
Conclusion 42
Appendix A 45
The Evaluative Instruments

A STUDY OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCIES DEMONSTRATED BY PRESERVICE TEACHERS OF MUSIC

Introduction

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 22 (n = 22) undergraduates certified to teach music by Washburn University's teacher preparation program from the Fall Semester of 1984 through Fall Semester 1990. The cooperating teachers involved in the study (n = 24) provided data regarding the competencies demonstrated by the student teachers. The student teachers also provided data through a self-evaluation enabled through the application of the same evaluative tool used by their respective cooperating teachers in assessing the preservice teachers' knowledge and competencies in teaching music.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the preservice music teachers' ability to transmit knowledge of subject to students through the demonstration of competencies related to teaching music. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What were the perceptions relative to the student teachers' knowledge of the subject areas in music?
2. To what extent were teaching competencies demonstrated by the preservice teachers of music?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency (Appendix A).

The cooperating teachers involved in the study provided data regarding the abilities demonstrated by the student teachers. The student teachers also provided data by using the same evaluative device designed for assessing their own abilities in the subject fields of music.

Evaluations were made by the two groups mentioned above relative to the preservice teachers' knowledge of the subject areas of music. The second area of the instrument dealt with the student teachers' competencies relative to individual musical performance, providing musical models in rehearsal/teaching, conducting techniques, verbal communication of musical concepts, communication of cognitive information, and in the use of technology in teaching.

The data obtained from the above respondents at the end of student teaching was tabulated and analyzed through the application of computer technology. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 1 through 13 depicts the results obtained from the

utilization of the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence, 5 indicating total competence, and NA if the undergraduate was not observed in performing a particular competency and/or simply did not have the opportunity to demonstrate the ability specified on the rating scale. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the frequency of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations pertaining to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Tables 1 through 13 illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations for the thirteen abilities related to teaching music as represented by the student teachers from Fall Semester 1984 through Fall Semester 1990.

The Chi-Square

Since the chi-square has been considered as either a parametric or non-parametric statistic; it is a test of significance appropriate in inferential statistics for such nominal data as head counts or frequency counts. Conceptually, a chi-square test compares the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies to determine if they are significantly different from each other.

Table 31 illustrates the frequency of the evaluative responses which occurred at each level of the rating

scale relative to the two groups of evaluators in the teaching of music.

The chi-square was applied to determine the significance of the differences between the frequencies of occurrence of a rating received at each point on the rating scale for responses to each of the respective rating scales for the student teachers in music. Table 14 shows the chi-square value of 10.7480 for the responses obtained in the teaching of music. In examining the Chi-Square Table of Critical Values relative to the chi-square values of 10.7480 with 4 degrees of freedom, it was found to have a probability level of significance of less than .01. For the purposes of this study, the probability level of .05 was selected as the desired level of significance. Since the probability level .05 was selected as the level of significance, then any value greater than 5 percent would mean that the data had not obtained statistical significance. Thus, the probability in this study is fewer than one time out of one hundred that the obtained results were due to chance or error. In other words, if the study was conducted 100 times, the same differences between the groups would be attributed to significant differences more than 99 times out of one hundred. However, less than one time out of a hundred ($p < .01$), those differences would be attributed to chance or error.

TABLE 1

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 1-KNOWLEDGE OF MUSIC THEORY/HARMONY/FORM

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	0
4	6	6
5	15	16
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.57	4.73
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.46

TABLE 2

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 2-KNOWLEDGE OF MUSIC HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	1
4	7	9
5	10	12
Competent		
NA	5	0
Mean	4.42	4.50
sTandard Deviation	0.69	0.60

TABLE 3

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 3-KNOWLEDGE OF AUTHENTIC PERFORMANCE PRACTICES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	0
4	5	4
5	13	17
Competent		
NA	4	1
Mean	4.55	4.81
Standard Deviation	0.69	0.40

TABLE 4

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 4-KNOWLEDGE OF TEACHING/PERFORMING MATERIALS FOR SCHOOL USE

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	1
4	7	9
5 Competent	14	12
NA	2	0
Mean	4.59	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.60

TABLE 5

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 5-KNOWLEDGE OF LONG AND SHORT RANGE PLANNING PROCEDURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	1
4	7	12
5 Competent	15	9
NA	0	0
Mean	4.54	4.36
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.58

TABLE 6

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 6-KNOWLEDGE OF REHEARSAL/LESSON FORMATS FOR OPTIMUM TEACHING

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	4	1
4	7	7
5	12	14
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.35	4.59
Standard Deviation	0.78	0.59

TABLE 7

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN MUSIC

ITEM 7-KNOWLEDGE OF MUSIC ADMINISTRATION

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	2
4	6	10
5 Competent	12	9
NA	5	1
Mean	4.58	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.61	0.66

TABLE 8

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN MUSIC

ITEM 8-COMPETENCEY IN INDIVIDUAL MUSICAL PERFORMANCE

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	0
4	4	6
5 Competent	16	16
NA	2	0
Mean	4.64	4.73
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.46

TABLE 9

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN MUSIC

ITEM 9-COMPETENCY IN PROVIDING MUSICAL MODELS IN REHEARSAL/TEACHING

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	3	0
4	4	5
5	17	16
Competent		
NA	0	1
Mean	4.58	4.76
Standard Deviation	0.72	0.44

TABLE 10

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN MUSIC

ITEM 10-COMPETENCY IN CONDUCTING TECHNIQUES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	3	4
4	8	6
5 Competent	11	12
NA	2	0
Mean	4.36	4.36
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.79

TABLE 11

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN MUSIC

ITEM 11-COMPETENCY IN VERBAL COMMUNICATION OF MUSICAL CONCEPTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	4	0
4	7	7
5	13	15
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.38	4.68
Standard Deviation	0.77	0.48

TABLE 12

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN MUSIC

ITEM 12-COMPETENCY IN THE COMMUNICATION OF COGNITIVE INFORMATION

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	3	0
4	6	11
5	14	11
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.48	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.51

TABLE 13

PART B-COMPETENCY IN MUSIC

ITEM 13-COMPETENCY IN THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1984-1990 N=24	Student Teachers 1984-1990 N=22
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	3	3
4	6	10
5	11	9
Competent		
NA	4	0
Mean	4.40	4.27
Standard Deviation	0.75	0.70

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO NUMERICAL POSITIONS ON RATING SCALE BY COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS IN MUSIC FROM 1984-1990

Rating Scale =	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Cooperating Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	0	32	80	173
Student Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	0	13	102	168
Total =	0	0	45	182	341

Chi-Square = 10.7480

p = <.0046 level of significance

A STUDY OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCIES OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS IN ART

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 12 (n = 12) undergraduates certified to teach art by Washburn University's teacher preparation program from the Spring Semester of 1985 through Fall Semester 1990. The cooperating teachers involved in the study (n = 13) provided data regarding the competencies demonstrated by the student teachers. The student teachers also provided data to the study by completing a self-evaluation that used the same evaluation form utilized by their respective cooperating teachers. The goal of this evaluation was to assess the preservice teachers' knowledge and competencies in teaching art.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the preservice art teachers' ability to transmit knowledge of subject to students through the demonstration of competencies related to teaching art. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What were the perceptions relative to the student teachers' knowledge of the subject areas in art?
2. To what extent were teaching competencies demonstrated by the preservice teachers of art?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency (Appendix A).

The cooperating teachers involved in the study provided data regarding the abilities demonstrated by the student teachers. The student teachers also provided data by using the same evaluative device designed for assessing their own abilities in the subject fields of art.

Evaluations were made by the two groups mentioned above relative to the preservice teachers' knowledge of the subject areas of art. The second area of the instrument dealt with the student teachers' competencies relative to lecturing, providing demonstrations, using models, using physical data, developing well designed projects, presenting clear procedures, and well defined objectives.

The data obtained from the above respondents at the end of student teaching was tabulated and analyzed through the application of computer technology. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 15 through 31 depicts the results obtained from the

utilization of the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence, 5 indicating total competence, and NA if the undergraduate was not observed in performing a particular competency and/or simply did not have the opportunity to demonstrate the ability specified on the rating scale. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the frequency of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations pertaining to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Tables 15 through 30 illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations for the sixteen abilities related to teaching art as represented by the student teachers from Spring Semester 1985 through Fall Semester 1990.

The Chi-Square

Since the chi-square has been considered as either a parametric or non-parametric statistic; it is a test of significance appropriate in inferential statistics for such nominal data as head counts or frequency counts. Conceptually, a chi-square test compares the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies to determine if they are significantly different from each other.

Table 31 illustrates the frequency of the evaluative responses which occurred at each level of the rating scale

relative to the two groups of evaluators in the teaching of art.

The chi-square was applied to determine the significance of the differences between the frequencies of occurrence of a rating received at each point on the rating scale for responses to each of the respective rating scales for the student teachers in art. Table 31 illustrates the chi-square value of 18.249 for the respondents engaged in the teaching of art. In examining the Chi-Square Table of Critical Values relative to the chi-square values of 18.249 with 4 degrees of freedom, it was found to have a probability level of significance less than .01. For the purposes of this study, the probability level of .05 was selected as the desired level of significance. Since the probability level .05 was selected as the level of significance, then any value greater than 5 percent would mean that the data had not obtained statistical significance. Thus, the probability in this study is fewer than one time out of one hundred that the obtained results were due to chance or error. In other words, if the study was conducted 100 times, the same differences between the groups would be attributed to significant differences more than 99 times out of one hundred. However, less than one time out of a hundred ($p < .01$), those differences would be attributed to chance or error.

TABLE 15

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 1-KNOWLEDGE OF DRAWING IN VARIOUS MEDIA

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	2	3
5	9	7
Competent		
NA	2	1
Mean	4.82	4.55
Standard Deviation	0.40	0.69

TABLE 16

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 2-KNOWLEDGE OF PERSPECTIVE

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	3	3
5	8	6
Competent		
NA	2	2
Mean	4.73	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.47	0.71

TABLE 17

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 3-KNOWLEDGE OF COLOR

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	1	0
4	3	1
5	9	9
Competent		
NA	0	1
Mean	4.62	4.64
Standard Deviation	0.65	0.92

TABLE 18

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 4-KNOWLEDGE OF DESIGN

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	0	0
4	4	2
5 Competent	9	8
NA	0	1
Mean	4.69	4.55
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.93

TABLE 19

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 5-KNOWLEDGE OF ART APPRECIATION

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	1	5
5	12	6
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.92	4.42
Standard Deviation	0.28	0.67

TABLE 20

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 6-KNOWLEDGE OF ARTS AND CRAFTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	1	0
4	1	4
5	5	4
Competent		
NA	6	3
Mean	4.57	4.22
Standard Deviation	0.79	0.97

TABLE 21

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 7-KNOWLEDGE OF PAINTING

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	0	1
4	4	3
5	8	7
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.67	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.49	0.98

TABLE 22

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN ART

ITEM 8-KNOWLEDGE OF SCULPTURE

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	1	9
5	6	0
Competent		
NA	6	2
Mean	4.86	3.90
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.32

TABLE 23

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN ART

ITEM 9-COMPETENCY IN LECTURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	1	0
3	2	2
4	7	8
5	10	1
Competent		
NA	0	1
Mean	3.92	3.91
Standard Deviation	0.86	0.54

TABLE 24

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN ART

ITEM 10-COMPETENCY IN DEMONSTRATIONS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	1	1
4	7	5
5	5	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.31	4.17
Standard Deviation	0.63	0.94

TABLE 25

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN ART

ITEM 11-COMPETENCY IN MODELS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	4	6
5	9	4
Competent		
NA	0	1
Mean	4.69	4.27
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.65

TABLE 26

PART B-COMPETENCIES IN ART

ITEM 12-COMPETENCY IN PHYSICAL DATA

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	0	0
4	4	3
5	9	8
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.69	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.90

TABLE 27

PART C-COMPETENCY IN ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY

PRACTICE AT THE STUDIO

ITEM 13-COMPETENCY IN DEVELOPING WELL DESIGNED PROJECTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	3	5
4	3	2
5	6	5
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.25	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.87	0.95

TABLE 28

PART C-COMPETENCY IN ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE AT THE STUDIO

ITEM 14-COMPETENCY IN PRESENTING CLEAR PROCEDURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	1	0
3	0	3
4	7	6
5	5	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.23	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.83	0.74

TABLE 29

PART C-COMPETENCY IN ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY

INTO PRACTICE AT THE STUDIO

ITEM 15-COMPETENCY IN PRESENTING WELL-DEFINED OBJECTIVES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	1	4
4	6	4
5	6	3
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.38	3.75
Standard Deviation	0.65	0.97

TABLE 30

PART C-COMPETENCY IN ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE AT THE STUDIO

ITEM 16-COMPETENCY IN MAKING PROJECTS MEANINGFUL TO STUDENTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=13	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=12
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	1	0
4	6	5
5	6	5
Competent		
NA	0	1
Mean	4.38	4.27
Standard Deviation	0.65	0.90

TABLE 31

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO NUMERICAL POSITIONS ON RATING SCALE BY COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS IN ART FROM 1985-1990

Rating Scale =	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Cooperating Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	2	10	63	122
Student Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	8	21	69	85
Total =	0	10	31	132	207

Chi-Square = 13.8925

p = <.0031 level of significance

Conclusion

The cooperating teachers involved in this study provided data regarding the teaching abilities demonstrated by the student teachers through responding to a rating scale. The student teachers also provided data by responding to the same instrument which was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence.

The self-evaluation applied by the student teachers in music obtained higher mean values on eight of the thirteen abilities. Those higher mean values pertained to the preservice teachers' knowledge of music theory/harmony/ form, music history, authentic performance practices, rehearsal/lesson formats for optimum teaching. The higher means values regarding the student teachers perception of competencies were in individual musical performances, providing models in rehearsal/teaching, the verbal communication of musical concepts, and in the communication of cognitive information. The cooperating teachers rated the preservice teachers in music higher relative to their knowledge of teaching/performing materials for school use, long and short range planning procedures, and knowledge of music administration. The competency viewed as best was in the use of technology in teaching. The total mean value for the respective groups concerning their responses to the

thirteen items pertaining to music was 4.49 for the student teachers and 4.55 for the cooperating teachers.

The evaluation applied by the cooperating teachers in art obtained higher mean values on fifteen of the sixteen abilities. Those higher mean values pertained to the preservice teachers' knowledge of drawing in various media, knowledge of perspective, knowledge of design, art appreciation, arts and crafts, and painting. The competencies with the higher mean values were in lecturing, demonstrations, models, physical data, developing well designed projects, presenting clear procedures and well defined objectives. In comparison, there was one instance when the highest mean values were obtained from the ratings provided by the student teachers. That particular rating pertained to the preservice teachers' knowledge of color. The total mean value for the respective art respondents was 4.53 for the cooperating teachers and 4.25 for the student teachers.

The chi-square test was applied to determine the significance of the differences between the frequencies of occurrence of a rating received at each point on the rating scale by the two groups of evaluators for teaching music and art, respectively. The chi-square score 10.7480 was obtained for music and the score of 13.8925 was derived for

art. Thus, the probability level of significance was less than .0046 for the evaluative outcomes for the subject field of music and .0031 relative to the evaluations pertaining to the preservice teachers' instructional experiences in the field of art. The above probability levels indicate that the chances are almost nill that the obtained results of significant differences were due to chance or error.

APPENDIX A

THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

TEACHING FIELD: MUSIC
Completed by the Cooperating Teacher

DIRECTIONS: The student from our Department is completing student teaching with you. As you have observed him/her, please rate the student's attainments of knowledge and competencies by checking the appropriate box. The number "1" indicates little knowledge or competence, while "5" indicates total competence needed for a teaching position. Check the column labeled "NA" if you have no indication of the student's attainment.

KNOWLEDGE OF:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Music theory/harmony/form						
Music history						
Authentic performance practices						
Teaching/performing materials for school use						
Long-and short-range planning procedures						
Rehearsal/lesson formats for optimum teaching						
Music Administration						

COMPETENCIES IN:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Individual musical performance						
Providing musical models in rehearsal/teaching						
Conducting techniques						
Verbal communication of musical concepts						
Communication of cognitive information						
Use of technology in teaching						

TEACHING FIELD: MUSIC
Completed by the Student Teacher

DIRECTIONS: Please rate your attainments of knowledge or competencies by checking the appropriate box. The number "1" indicates little knowledge or competence, while "5" indicates total competence needed for a teaching position. Check the column labeled "NA" if you regard the knowledge or competence as irrelevant to your work.

KNOWLEDGE OF:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Music theory/harmony/form	___	___	___	___	___	____
Music history	___	___	___	___	___	____
Authentic performance practices	___	___	___	___	___	____
Teaching/performing materials for school use	___	___	___	___	___	____
Long-and short-range planning procedures	___	___	___	___	___	____
Rehearsal/lesson formats for optimum teaching	___	___	___	___	___	____
Music administration	___	___	___	___	___	____

COMPETENCIES IN:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Individual musical performance	___	___	___	___	___	____
Providing musical models in rehearsal/teaching	___	___	___	___	___	____
Conducting techniques	___	___	___	___	___	____
Verbal communication of musical concepts	___	___	___	___	___	____
Communication of cognitive information	___	___	___	___	___	____
Use of technology in teaching	___	___	___	___	___	____

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE COOPERATING TEACHER
TEACHING FIELD
ART

Directions: Rate the Student Teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Knowledge of subject area:						
A. Drawing in various media	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Drawing techniques i.e. perspective, figure	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Color/Design	___	___	___	___	___	___
D. Art Appreciation/History/Criticism	___	___	___	___	___	___
E. Jewelry/Textiles	___	___	___	___	___	___
F. Painting in various media	___	___	___	___	___	___
G. Sculpture/Ceramics	___	___	___	___	___	___
H. Graphic Arts/Photography/Printmaking	___	___	___	___	___	___
I. Art Education	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Ability to transmit subject to student using:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
A. Lectures	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Demonstrations using various media techniques	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Art Exemplars	___	___	___	___	___	___
D. Physical Data A.V., books reference material	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Ability to translate theory into practice in the studio	1	2	3	4	5	NA
A. Are the projects meaningful and appropriate for the students?	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Are the objectives well-defined?	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Are the projects well structured for presentation?	___	___	___	___	___	___
D. Are the procedures clear?	___	___	___	___	___	___
E. Are the criteria for evaluation clear?	___	___	___	___	___	___

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE STUDENT TEACHER
TEACHING FIELD
ART

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Knowledge of subject area:						
A. Drawing in various media						
B. Drawing techniques i.e. perspective, figure						
C. Color/Design						
D. Art Appreciation/History/Criticism						
E. Jewelry/Textiles						
F. Painting in various media						
G. Sculpture/Ceramics						
H. Graphic Arts/Photography/Printmaking						
I. Art Education						
2. Ability to transmit subject to student using:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
A. Lectures						
B. Demonstrations using various media techniques						
C. Art Exemplars						
D. Physical Data A.V., books reference material						
3. Ability to translate theory into practice in the studio	1	2	3	4	5	NA
A. Are the projects meaningful and appropriate for the students?						
B. Are the objectives well-defined?						
C. Are the projects well structured for presentation?						
D. Are the procedures clear?						
E. Are the criteria for evaluation clear?						